

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the above-identified patent application.
Claims 1-22 are amended herein. Claims 23-24 are cancelled herein. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 12 is objected to because it depends on itself. Applicants have amended Claim 12 to depend from Independent Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request the objection to Claim 12 be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants have amended Claims 1-19 to be directed to a “computer implemented method” which is tied to a computer. A computer is a machine and thus Claims 1-19 satisfy requirement (1) set forth by the Examiner in section 5 of the current Action. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-19 are directed to statutory subject matter and Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Applicants have amended Claims 20-22 to be directed to a “computer usable storage medium” which is tied to a tangible article. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 20-22 are directed to statutory subject matter and Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

35 U.S.C. § 102(a/e)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 20, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Casco-Arias et al. (2003/0065942). Applicants have reviewed the above cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3, 4, 20 are not anticipated by Casco-Arias for at least the following rationale. Claims 23 and 24 are cancelled herein, thus the rejection is moot.

Independent Claim 1 and similarly independent Claim 20 recite the features:

determining a strength of one of said plurality of password policies based on said feedback; and
dynamically modifying one of said plurality of password policies based on said strength.

“[A]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of *each and every element* of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim” *Lindemann Maschinefabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added).

MPEP §2131 provides:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Casco-Arias fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1 and 20, arranged as in the claim.

In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that Casco-Arias merely teaches implementing a password policy for password modification. When a user modifies a password, the newly proposed password is checked against password policies.

In contrast, the present claimed invention dynamically modifies the password policies, thus enabling greater password protection based on the strength of the password policies.

For at least the foregoing rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, and Claim 20 are not anticipated by Casco-Arias under 35 U.S.C. §102(a/e). As such, Applicants submit Claims 1, 3, 4 and 20 are not anticipated by Casco-Arias and respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Claims 2, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casco-Arias in view of Cole (2002/0161707). Applicants have reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Independent Claims 1 and 20 are patentable over Casco-Arias in view of Cole for at least the following rationale.

As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Casco-Arias fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of “determining a strength of one of said plurality of password policies based on said feedback; and dynamically modifying one of said plurality of password policies based on said strength,” as claimed. Applicants have reviewed Cole and respectfully submit that Cole fails to remedy the deficiencies of Casco-Arias. Cole may teach exchanging XML messages, however, Cole fails to teach or suggest “determining a strength of one of said plurality of password policies based on said feedback; and dynamically modifying one of said plurality of password policies based on said strength,” as claimed.

For this rational, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 19 and 21 are patentable over Casco-Arias in view of Cole and respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Claims 6-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casco-Arias in view of Password Policy of eRA (PP hereafter). Applicants have reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6-18 and 22 are patentable over Casco-Arias in view of PP for at least the following rationale.

As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Casco-Arias fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of “determining a strength of one of said

plurality of password policies based on said feedback; and dynamically modifying one of said plurality of password policies based on said strength,” as claimed. Applicants have reviewed PP and respectfully submit that PP fails to remedy the deficiencies of Casco-Arias.

In fact, PP teaches away from the claimed feature of “enforcing at least one of said plurality of password policies described within said password policy data structure by said password policy enforcement agent.” In section 6.0 of PP, it states “the information system security officer (ISSO) is responsible for ensuring that this policy is followed. This is very different and teaches away from a policy enforcement agent performing the enforcement, as claimed.

As such, and for this rational, Applicants submit that the claimed features of Claims 6-18 and 22 are patentable over Casco-Arias alone and in combination with PP and Applicants respectfully the rejection be removed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-22 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-22 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 09/18/2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 377-0500